

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-148

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

July 10, 2025

The Complainant alleged a justice of the peace improperly denied a motion to set aside judgment.

The role of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine whether a judicial officer has engaged in conduct that violates the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct or Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution. There must be clear and convincing evidence of such a violation in order for the Commission to take disciplinary action against a judicial officer.

The allegations of the complaint in this matter solely raised disagreements with legal rulings. The Commission does not have jurisdiction to overturn, amend, or remand a judicial officer's legal rulings. "A good faith error of fact or law does not violate this rule. However, a pattern of legal error or an intentional disregard of the law may constitute misconduct." *See* comment 3 to Rule 2.2 of the Code of Judicial conduct. Any violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct must be proven by clear and convincing evidence.

A mistake in a ruling does not automatically mean that the judicial officer has engaged in judicial misconduct. Judicial officers are required to exercise their discretion in making their decisions. Even if a judicial officer's decision is legally or factually incorrect, the ruling is generally considered to be "legal error" and not "ethical misconduct" that the Commission can address. When a complaint to the Commission solely relates to the correctness of a judicial officer's legal decisions, the Complainant is seeking the Commission to function in the capacity of an appellate court. Correcting legal errors is the role of the appellate courts, not the Commission.

The Commission is a regulatory body with limited jurisdiction. The Commission is not a court, and as such, it does not have any authority to overturn a judicial officer's rulings, intervene in a case, assign a new judge to hear a case, or award any monetary or other relief. The Commission process cannot be a substitute for seeking appellate review.

The Commission reviewed all information submitted by the Complainant and concluded there was not clear and convincing evidence of ethical misconduct in this matter. The complaint is therefore dismissed pursuant to Commission Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

A Duty Panel comprised of Commission members Regina L. Nassen, Scott H. O'Connor, and Christopher P. Staring considered this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on July 10, 2025.

# Formal Judicial Complaint Against Judge In Case #

While this complaint pertains specifically to the fiduciary breach and judicial misconduct of Judge \_\_\_\_\_ in relation to Case # \_\_\_\_\_ it is important to clarify that this is not an isolated issue, nor a reactionary filing. Rather, it forms part of a broader fiduciary process currently underway to **marshal all assets, enforce proper accounting, and restore lawful jurisdiction over all property and instruments tied to my estate and NAME.**

As Executor-Beneficiary of the estate and Agent of Record for the private business trust into which legal and equitable title have been conveyed, I bring this complaint not as a litigant, but as a fiduciary. My objective is the resolution of outstanding breaches of trust, not retaliation. This Commission now stands in the position to evaluate the facts in light of that purpose.

This complaint is not submitted as a punitive measure against Judge \_\_\_\_\_, but rather as a necessary procedural step to ensure **full transparency, accountability, and adherence to fiduciary responsibilities within the judicial system of the State of Arizona.**

The Arizona judiciary has a direct obligation to ensure that judges do not overstep their legal capacity and assume unauthorized administrative control over financial instruments tied to private trust property. This complaint seeks not only to address prior fiduciary breaches, but to afford this Commission a clear opportunity to take corrective action before further enforcement becomes necessary.

Judge \_\_\_\_\_, presiding over the \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Court, has likely engaged in judicial misconduct **by failing to uphold fiduciary responsibilities, refusing to provide required financial disclosures, and disregarding multiple formal demands to account for or liquidate securities tied to my NAME and estate.** His failure to respond in good faith constitutes a direct violation of judicial ethics and fiduciary duty, requiring immediate review and corrective action by this Commission.

## Summary of Judicial Misconduct & Fiduciary Breach

Judge \_\_\_\_\_ engaged in multiple likely violations of fiduciary duty and judicial ethics in his handling of Case # \_\_\_\_\_. These breaches include:

- **Failure to provide full financial disclosure regarding securities and financial transactions** tied to my NAME and estate.

- **Breach of fiduciary duty by engaging in unauthorized financial administration** over private trust property.
- **Assuming de facto trustee control over financial instruments** without proper legal standing.
- **Failing to remedy fiduciary breach despite multiple formal notices** provided to him directly.
- **Allowing the continued monetization of financial instruments tied to my NAME**, despite having been explicitly noticed that this was unlawful.

These actions resulted in **material financial injury to my private trust and estate** and warrant immediate review by the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct.

## **Chronological Timeline of Fiduciary Breach**

The following timeline establishes when key legal actions were taken, when financial instruments were likely created, and when Judge \_\_\_\_\_ fiduciary duty was breached due to failure to comply with lawful notices and directives. While the initial case may have been monetized under lawful presumptions, those presumptions were later rebutted, and Judge \_\_\_\_\_ continued administration created an irreconcilable contradiction.

### **Initial Legal Action Against the Estate & Creation of Securities**

– Case \_\_\_\_\_ initiated in \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Court. A surety bond was likely created at this point, and an implied surety status upon the estate, along with the issuance of a CUSIP number and additional securities.

– Small Claims Judgment entered against the estate. Jurisdiction was solidified when an appearance was made in Small Claims Court, thereby likely reinforcing the estate's presumed suretyship and the court's administrative claim.

– Garnishment Application filed by the opposing party, requesting seizure of funds related to the judgment

– Writ of Garnishment Issued, authorizing asset seizure related to the judgment.

## My Legal Notices Asserting Trust Rights & Severance of Implied Suretyship

– Non-UCC Financing Statement filed with the Iowa Secretary of State, securing my superior claim over all NAME-related assets and severing implied surety status.

– Declaration of Status recorded in \_\_\_\_\_ County, \_\_\_\_\_, formally asserting my legal and equitable position over the NAME and estate, separating it from any public trust structure. This document rescinded all signatures of suretyship *nunc pro tunc, ab initio*, ensuring that any prior assumption of liability for the NAME was void from the beginning.

& \_\_\_\_\_ – “ \_\_\_\_\_ View, noticing the public about its operation in commerce in the State of Arizona.

– Name Change Order granted in \_\_\_\_\_ County \_\_\_\_\_ Court, changing “ \_\_\_\_\_ ’ to “ \_\_\_\_\_ ”.

– Name Change Order recorded in \_\_\_\_\_ County, putting the public on notice of the merging of legal and equitable title and dissolving any former public trust structure over the NAME.

– Non-UCC Financing Statement filed with the \_\_\_\_\_ Secretary of State recorded in \_\_\_\_\_ County Recorder’s Office.

– Notice of Estoppel recorded in \_\_\_\_\_ County, formally asserting that my NAME is private trust property and prohibiting unauthorized monetization. This Notice references the Fee and Fine Schedule to be found in my \_\_\_\_\_ Declaration of Status recording, making clear that from this point forward, any administration of the NAME was not only unlawful, but a clear Breach of Trust and a \_\_\_\_\_ fee plus 10% per annum beginning one year after the recording.

## Timeline of Judicial Awareness and Implications of Willful Dishonor

The following sequence of public and private legal instruments—beginning with the Non-UCC Financing Statement on \_\_\_\_\_, and culminating in the Final

Opportunity to Cure on \_\_\_\_\_—establishes a clear, unbroken chain of judicial awareness. These filings and notices placed Judge \_\_\_\_\_ on both **constructive and actual notice** of the trust’s legal status, my perfected standing, and his resulting fiduciary obligations.

### Judicial Silence as Dishonor

The legal implications of this timeline are substantial. His **silence in the face of formal notice** constituted **acquiescence by estoppel**, barring him from later claiming ignorance or jurisdiction. His **failure to take corrective action** despite being given multiple procedural opportunities—including a cure window with no penalties—constitutes **willful dishonor**. Under trust law, this triggers his conversion into a **constructive trustee**, rendering him **personally liable** for any continued administrative action over trust property.

Furthermore, his continued inaction after receiving the Motion to Set Aside Judgment and the Final Opportunity to Cure reflects not mere negligence, but **intentional breach of trust**, a **violation of judicial ethics**, and a **dereliction of fiduciary duty**. It constitutes **bad faith conduct under color of law**, entitling me to seek personal redress through his **judicial performance bond**, and if necessary, escalate the matter to **federal oversight for constitutional violations and securities-related misconduct**.

The judiciary cannot have it both ways. A judge who continues to act after receiving lawful notice, while refusing to acknowledge the legal framework placed before him, is not protected by procedural ambiguity—he is operating in **willful breach** of both **fiduciary and constitutional law**.

### Judge \_\_\_\_\_ Fiduciary Breach

– Motion to Set Aside Judgment (Placing Judge \_\_\_\_\_ on

#### Notice of Private Trust Property & Fiduciary Obligations)

On this date, I filed a **Motion to Set Aside Judgment, acting in my capacity as Agent of Record on behalf of the trust**. This motion was marked “\_\_\_\_\_”

\_\_\_\_\_” in cursive purple ink in all margins, sent by private registered mail, reinforcing its **private status** and clarifying that it was a matter of private trust law, not statutory jurisdiction. This motion was not merely a procedural filing—it was a **formal notice to the court that it was in possession of private trust property and was administrating it without proper authority**.

The motion established that the Defendant was a **fiction in commerce and the property of a Private Business Trust**, placing the court on direct notice that the NAME

and estate were not public property subject to judicial administration. The filing included:

- An exemplified copy of the Name Change Order recorded in \_\_\_\_\_ County.
- A formal Notice of Estoppel recorded in \_\_\_\_\_ County on \_\_\_\_\_
- The Fee & Fine Schedule (recorded in \_\_\_\_\_ County, \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_ and referenced in the Notice of Estoppel) outlining financial liabilities for breaches of trust.

The motion further invoked the conflict between rule of law and rule of equity over the same subject matter, reinforcing that equity must prevail. Despite this, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ denied the motion without recognizing the superior equitable claim, thereby rejecting trust law principles and allowing continued unauthorized administration of trust property.

By denying the motion while remaining in possession of private trust property, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ placed himself in the position of a de facto trustee over a constructive trust. From this point forward, his continued unauthorized use and monetization of the NAME and estate constituted a knowing breach of fiduciary duty, subjecting him to the Fee and Fine Schedule for willful and overt Breach of Trust in administrating private trust property without consent.

### RECOGNITION BY STATE & FEDERAL AGENCIES

As an adjunct to Judge \_\_\_\_\_ willful disregard of the trust in this Motion, it is important to note:

1. The Arizona \_\_\_\_\_ ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) has directly engaged in commerce with the \_\_\_\_\_ Private Business Trust by issuing a vehicle title in its exact name: “ \_\_\_\_\_ Private Business Trust” (Title Number \_\_\_\_\_ ).

This acknowledgment by a state agency underscores the trust's legal standing has already been acknowledged in the State of Arizona by an Arizona State Agency. It is inconsistent and legally untenable for one state agency to recognize the trust's validity while Judge \_\_\_\_\_ chooses to deny, disregard, and ignore its existence in his proceedings. Such selective acknowledgment undermines the uniform application of trust law principles across state agencies.

2. In addition to recognition by the Arizona \_\_\_\_\_ the Arizona \_\_\_\_\_ ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) has formally recognized the \_\_\_\_\_

**THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS  
TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE  
PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED  
COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.**

**FOR ACCESS TO THE  
REMAINDER OF THE  
COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER,  
PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST  
IN WRITING TO THE  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL  
CONDUCT AND REFERENCE  
THE COMMISSION CASE  
NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.**